



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,999	12/21/2001	Andreas N. Dorsel	10992125-2	6346
7590	02/04/2005		EXAMINER	
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.			FORMAN, BETTY J	
Intellectual Property Administration				
Legal Department, DL429			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P. O. Box 7599			1634	
Loveland, CO 80537-0599			DATE MAILED: 02/04/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/036,999	DORSEL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	BJ Forman	1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5,7-11 and 18-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7-11 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 16 November 2004 has been entered.

Status of the Claims

2. This action is in response to papers filed 16 November 2004 in which claim 7 was amended and claims 12-17 were canceled. All of the amendments have been thoroughly reviewed and entered.

The previous rejections in the Office Action dated 13 July 2004, not reiterated below, are withdrawn in view of the amendments. Applicant's arguments have been thoroughly reviewed and are discussed below as they apply to the instant grounds for rejection. New grounds for rejection are discussed.

Claims 1-5, 7-11 and 18-20 are under prosecution.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 5, 7, 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lehman et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,237,172, issued 17 August 1993).

Regarding Claim 1, Lehman et al discloses a method comprising scanning an interrogating light across multiple sites on an array package wherein the package includes an addressable array of multiple features of different moieties (i.e. different lines on a document), detecting signals from scanned sites and decreasing power of interrogating light for a first site during the scanning wherein the first site is outside the area occupied by the array (i.e. calibration scan lines #28/30, Column 5, lines 36-58 and Fig. 3-6).

The claims are drawn to scanning light across an array package comprising an addressable array of multiple features of different moieties. However, neither the claims nor specification define the array, package, addressable array, feature or moieties so as to exclude any elements found in the scanning art. Lehman teaches document scanning wherein the document comprises lines (Column 2, lines 17-30). Because lines on a document constitute arrayed elements (e.g. letters) and because the claims are broadly written so as to encompass any arrayed elements in the scanning art, Lehman teaches the method as claimed.

Regarding Claim 5, Lehman et al discloses a method comprising scanning light across multiple sites on an array, detecting signals from scanned sites emitted in response to the light and altering power of the light for a first site wherein the first site is an array feature and wherein the power is altered based on emitted signal from the first site (Column 3, lines 1-24; Column 5, line 22-Column 6, line 32; and Column 11, lines 3-47).

Regarding Claim 7, Lehman et al disclose a method comprising prior to scanning an array, calibrating (i.e. pre-scan calibration) an interrogating light power versus a control signal, scanning the light across multiple sites on an array (i.e. lines on a document), detecting signals from the site emitted in response to interrogating light, and altering the light power for a site on the array during the scanning based on a determination that the emitted signal will be outside a predetermined range (Column 5, line 22-Column 6, line 32).

Regarding Claim 10, Lehman et al discloses the method wherein the power is reduced based on a determination that an emitted signal would exceed a predetermined value i.e. adjusted (Column 6, lines 2-32 and Column 11, lines 3-48).

Regarding Claim 11, Lehman et al discloses the method wherein the determination is based on an emitted signal from the first site i.e. based on the pre-scan calibration signal (Column 3, lines 1-24 and Column 11, lines 3-48).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bengtsson (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,390, filed 4 May 1998) in view of Rava et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,874,219, filed 9 April 1996).

Regarding Claim 1, Bengtsson teaches a method comprising: scanning an interrogating light across multiple sites on an array package which scanned sites include multiple features of the array; detecting signals from respective scanned sites emitted in response to the interrogating light; and decreasing (turning off) the interrogating light power for a first site on the array package during the array scanning (Column 8, lines 11-17) wherein the first site is outside an area occupied by the array (i.e. calibration area, Column 6, lines 23-43, Column 8, line 17 defined as adjacent pixels or adjacent scan lines, Column 7, lines 23-25 and 32-35) and

Art Unit: 1634

(Column 6, line 1-Column 7, line 60). Bengtsson teaches the method wherein the multiple sites on the array are elements arranged in the commonly known microarray (Column 5, lines 28-31) but they do not specifically teach their microarray includes an addressable array of multiple features of different moieties. However, microarray including an addressable array of multiple features of different moieties were well known in the art at the time the claimed invention was made as taught by Rava et al (Abstract). Rava et al teach a similar method comprising: scanning an interrogating light across multiple sites on an array package which scanned sites include multiple features of the array; detecting signals from respective scanned sites emitted in response to the interrogating light (Column 5, lines 40-56) wherein the array includes an addressable array of multiple features of different moieties (Column 2, lines 35-42) and wherein the method provides for high throughput assays thereby improving efficiency of assay performance (Column 4, lines 33-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to apply the addressable multiple feature arrays of Rava et al to the microarray detection of Bengtsson to thereby detect high throughput assays for the expected benefit of improving efficiency of assay performance as taught by Rava et al (Column 4, lines 33-40).

Regarding Claim 2, Bengtsson teaches the method wherein the interrogating light power is reduced based on a determination that the emitted signal would exceed a predetermined value (Column 2, lines 22-39 and Column 6, lines 44-64).

Regarding Claim 3, Bengtsson teaches the method wherein the interrogating light power is increased based on a determination that the emitted signal will be below a predetermined value (Column 2, lines 22-39 and Column 6, lines 44-64)

Regarding Claim 4, Bengtsson teach the method wherein the determination is based on the emitted signal detected from the first site (Column 6, lines 23-29).

Regarding Claim 5, Bengtsson teach a method comprising scanning interrogating light across multiple sites of an array detecting signal from respective scanned sites emitted in response to the light and altering the power of the interrogating light for a first site which is an array feature and wherein interrogating light power is altered based on the signal emitted from the first site when the light initially illuminates the first site (i.e. scan line 301 is scanned, attenuation is adjusted (power decreased) to avoid saturation, Column 5, lines 43-47 and Column 49-64).

Regarding Claim 18, Bengtsson teaches a method comprising scanning an interrogating light across multiples sites on an array package (microarray), detecting signals from scanned sites emitted in response to interrogating light and altering power of interrogating light (using power modulator) for a first site during array scanning based determining that the emitted signal will be outside a predetermined intensity range wherein the interrogating is altered during a row scan of the interrogating light (Column 8, lines 11-23).

Regarding Claim 19, Bengtsson et al teaches the method the microarray is arranged in rows (Fig. 2 and Column 28-40). Furthermore, Rava provide motivation for providing microarray having the row arrangement i.e. instrumentations exists for handing and reading this format and hence using the known format does not require extensive re-engineering (Column 8, lines 51-56 and Column 10, lines 40-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to apply the row arrangement of Rava et al to the microarray of Bengtsson et al based on the advantages taught by Rava et al i.e. instrumentations exists for handing and reading this format and hence using the known format does not require extensive re-engineering (Column 8, lines 51-56).

Regarding Claim 20, Bengtsson teaches line by line scanning (Fig. 3) which clearly suggests row by row scanning and Rava et al teach that technology exists for reading microarrays arranged in rows (Column 10, lines 40-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to read the microarray of

Bengtsson by scanning row by row as they suggest based on the availability of technologies for reading microarrays arranged in row format as taught by Rava (Column 10, lines 40-44).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant argues that Bengtsson teaches the calibration area within the array and not outside as instantly claimed. The argument has been considered but is not found persuasive because, as stated in the office action, Bengtsson specifically teaches scanning the sample as a calibration area to locate the array (Column 6, lines 29) whereby the “entire sample” is scanned (column 6, lines 1-6). Because, they need to “locate the array”, they must scan areas outside the array, if not, there would be no need to “locate the array”.

Applicant argues that Bengtsson does not turn off the power based on a signal emitted from the first site. The argument has been considered but is not found persuasive because Bengtsson clearly teaches altering power based on signal emitted (i.e. scan line 301 is scanned, attenuation is adjusted (power decreased) to avoid saturation, Column 5, lines 43-47 and Column 49-64). when signal is detected, the power is turned off) Col. 6, lines 1-64 and Fig. 4 as claimed.

Regarding Claim 18, Applicant argues that Bengtsson does not teach turning off power is based on locations of individual elements as claimed. Because the Bengtsson specifically teaches “power modulator 500 that controls laser excitation sources 12a and 14a to essentially turn the lasers 12 and 14 off for some fraction of the time that the system is scanning across a scan line.....Specifically, the system turns off the lasers for a fraction of the scanning of each element or dot in the scan line.” (Column 8, lines 12-18). Because Bengtsson turns the lasers off for each element or dot while scanning the location of that element or dot, the lasers are turned off (power is altered) based on the location of that element or dot.

8. Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bengtsson (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,390, filed 4 May 1998) in view of Rava et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,874,219, filed 9 April 1996) and Lehman et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,237,172, issued 17 August 1993).

Regarding Claim 7, Bengtsson teaches a method comprising: calibrating an interrogating light power versus a control signal characteristic from a light system which provides the interrogating light of a power which varies in response to the control signal characteristic; scanning an interrogating light across multiple sites on an array package which scanned sites include multiple features of the array; detecting signals from respective scanned sites emitted in response to the interrogating light; and altering the interrogating light power for a first site on the array package during the scanning step (Column 8, lines 11-23) based on location of the first site or on a determination that the emitted signal from the first site will be outside a predetermined range absent the altering (Column 6, line 1-Column 7, line 60). Bengtsson teaches the method wherein the multiple sites on the array are elements arranged in the commonly known microarray (Column 5, lines 28-31) but they do not specifically teach their microarray includes an addressable array of multiple features of different moieties. However, microarray including an addressable array of multiple features of different moieties were well known in the art at the time the claimed invention was made as taught by Rava et al (Abstract). Rava et al teach a similar method comprising: scanning an interrogating light across multiple sites on an array package which scanned sites include multiple features of the array; detecting signals from respective scanned sites emitted in response to the interrogating light (Column 5, lines 40-56) wherein the array includes an addressable array of multiple features of different moieties (Column 2, lines 35-42) and wherein the method provides for high throughput assays thereby improving efficiency of assay performance (Column 4, lines 33-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to apply the addressable multiple feature arrays of Rava et al to the

microarray scanning of Bengtsson to thereby scan and detect high throughput assays for the expected benefit of improving efficiency of assay performance as taught by Rava et al (Column 4, lines 33-40).

Bengtsson and Rava do not teach a step of pre-calibration prior to scanning. However, Lehman et al teach a similar method comprising pre-calibration performed prior to scanning their array wherein the pre-calibration coupled with calibration during the scan (dynamic calibration) provides optimized data collection at a throughput rate determined by the maximum rate of scanning (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to apply the pre-calibration step of Lehman et al to the calibration method of Bengtsson for the expected benefit of providing optimized data collection at a rate equal to maximum rate of scanning as taught by Lehman (Abstract).

Regarding Claim 8, Bengtsson teach the method wherein a microarray is scanned (Column 5, lines 27-67 but they do not teach that their scanning is repeated for each of multiple array packages. However, Rava et al teach the similar method wherein multiple arrays are scanned (Column 4, lines 24-30 and Column 5, lines 40-56) and wherein the method provides for high throughput assays thereby improving efficiency of assay performance (Column 4, lines 33-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to apply the multiple array scanning of Rava et al to the microarray scanning of Bengtsson to thereby scan and detect high throughput assays for the expected benefit of improving efficiency of assay performance as taught by Rava et al (Column 4, lines 33-40).

Regarding Claim 9, Bengtsson teaches the method wherein the light system includes a light source and an optical attenuator through which light from the source passes to provide the interrogating light and wherein the control signal comprises a signal from the optical

Art Unit: 1634

attenuator which provides a variable attenuation in response to the characteristic of the control (Column 3, line 32-Column 4, line 7).

Regarding Claim 10, Bengtsson teaches the method wherein the interrogating light power is reduced based on a determination that the emitted signal would exceed a predetermined value (Column 2, lines 22-39 and Column 6, lines 44-64).

Regarding Claim 11, Bengtsson teach the method wherein the determination is based on the emitted signal detected from the first site (Column 6, lines 23-43).

Conclusion

9. No claim is allowed.
10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BJ Forman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0741. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00 TO 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Jones can be reached on (571) 272-0745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your

Art Unit: 1634

application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.



BJ Forman, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1634
February 3, 2005